The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/22/3313298
40 Thirlmere Avenue, Horwich, Bolton, BL6 6DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Gillian Meadow against the decision of Bolton Council.
- The application Ref 14595/22, dated 12 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2022.
- The development proposed is to 'Demolish existing porch & erect a single storey front extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. At my visit I saw that a front extension was substantially under construction at the property and nearly complete externally. I have not been told whether or not permission has been granted for that extension but, in any case, I have determined this appeal proposal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policy CG3 of Bolton's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) which requires that development is compatible with the surrounding area in terms of, amongst other things, scale and massing. The National Planning Policy Framework also seeks to encourage high quality design.

4. The appeal site comprises a modern end terraced, two storey dwelling house which is set back from the road behind a front drive and garden. Thirlmere Avenue and the surrounding area comprises many such terraces. In this terrace, each of the dwellings has been extended to the front with an extension across some two thirds of the width of the dwelling. Those extensions have a lean-to roof and each one is aligned with its neighbour. They are generally of a similar design with a door adjacent to large windows with a low cill in both the front and side elevations. Whilst external window and wall materials vary, the consistency in size, scale and design in this terrace makes a positive contribution to its presence in the street scene.

5. The proposal would extend across the width of the dwelling to provide an extended open plan kitchen/living space with adjacent utility area, which given its position at the end of the terrace, would be acceptable and its lean-to roof

would match that of the adjoining dwelling. However, it also includes a centrally positioned porch with a gabled roof which would project forward of the front extension by some 1.3m according to the plans. The projection and roof form of that porch would be at odds with the alignment and the lean-to roofs of other front extensions in this terrace. The very small size of the proposed windows in the front extension either side of the porch would be out of scale with the larger front windows elsewhere in the terrace and this adds to my concerns. The proposal would have a jarring appearance and would disrupt the consistency of the terrace, detracting from its presence in the street scene.

6. I accept that the proposed porch is of a small scale and by itself could be permitted development. However, that is not the case here because it forms part of the wider extension and that does not provide justification for this proposal.

7. I conclude then, that by reason of the siting and roof form of the proposed porch and the size and scale of the windows, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to the policy CG3 referred to earlier. It would also fail to accord with the Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector